THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

ITS CONTINUOUS ORGANIC LIFE, AND ITS CATHOLIC RESTORATION.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED

Before the CHURCH OF ENGLAND INSTITUTE, HALIFAX,

AND SUBSEQUENTLY

In MONTREAL and SHERBROOKE, Province of Quebec,

AND IN

WINDSOR, Nova Scotia,

BY THE REV. ISAAC BROCK, D.D.,

RECTOR OF HORTON AND CANON OF ST. LUKE'S CATHEDRAL, HALIFAX.

"*Ecclesia Anglicana Libera Sit.*"

MAGNA CHARTA, A.D. 1215.

TO WHICH IS APPENDED A SERMON,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR, ON

THE THREE-FOLD APOSTOLIC MINISTRY OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH,

PREACHED IN ST. JAMES' CHURCH, KENTVILLE, N. S., ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1891.

MORTON & CO.,
143 BARRINGTON STREET, HALIFAX.
A. D. 1891.

[*Price 12 cents.*]

LP
012
891
864

Purchased from the Chancellor Richardson Memorial Fund

CANADIANA COLLECTION QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY AT KINGSTON

ONTARIO CANADA

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA

Queen's University at Kingston

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

ITS CONTINUOUS ORGANIC LIFE, AND ITS CATHOLIC RESTORATION.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED

Before the CHURCH OF ENGLAND INSTITUTE, HALIFAX,

AND SUBSEQUENTLY

In MONTREAL and SHERBROOKE, Province of Quebec,

AND IN

WINDSOR, Nova Scotia,

BY THE REV. ISAAC BROCK, D.D.,

RECTOR OF HORTON AND CANON OF ST. LUKE'S CATHEDRAL, HALIFAX.

"*Ecclesia Anglicana Libera Sit.*"

MAGNA CHARTA, A.D. 1215.

TO WHICH IS APPENDED A SERMON,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR, ON

THE THREE-FOLD APOSTOLIC MINISTRY OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH,

PREACHED IN ST. JAMES' CHURCH, KENTVILLE, N. S.,
ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1891.

MORTON & CO.,
143 BARRINGTON STREET, HALIFAX.
A. D. 1891.

[*Price 12 cents.*]

PREFACE.

This Lecture is published at the request of many who heard it, and who thought that it would prove helpful to those members of our Church who have neither the time nor the inclination to peruse those Histories of the Church of England which set forth at length the matter brought into a small compass in this Lecture. If it removes from any minds an error fostered by our Common School Histories, that the Church of England is the child of the Reformation, its publication will not have been in vain.

The nature of the subject handled admitted only the briefest reference to the Early British Church. The author refers to Lane's Illustrated Notes, vol. I., and to "Little's Reasons for Being a Churchman," for further information on this interesting subject.

Reference is made in the Lecture to the beginning of schism from the English branch of the Holy Catholic Church: the beginning came from Rome: the Puritan schism (the parent of modern dissent from the Catholic Church in England) quickly followed. On this subject, see Lane's Illustrated Notes. vol. II.

A Sermon containing a seven-fold argument for the Three-fold Ministry of the Holy Catholic Church, recently preached in St. James' Church, Kentville, is added. It is an attempt to present a somewhat difficult subject in a popular form, in a form, that is, which will take hold of the mind of people in general.

This Pamphlet can be had at the rate of $1.00 for ten copies, or $2.00 for twenty-five copies (both rates including postage), on application to the author or the publishers. Any profits arising from the sale of this Pamphlet will be given to Guild of St. James' Church, Kentville.

The Rectory, Kentville, Nova Scotia,
October 31, 1891.

DATES REFERRED TO IN THE LECTURE.

I. EARLY BRITISH PERIOD.

A. D. 304 (June 17)...Martyrdom of St. Alban.
314.....Council of Arles: three British Bishops present.

II. ANGLO-SAXON PERIOD.

A. D. 597.....Mission of St. Augustine to Kent.
635.....St. Aidan of Iona, Bishop of Northumbria.
664.....Synod of Whitby.
668–690.....Episcopate of Theodore, 7th Archbishop of Canterbury.
678.....Division by Theodore of the Diocese of Northumbria.
Wilfrid's appeal to Rome.
690–800.....The golden age of the Anglo-Saxon Church.
800.....Coronation of Charlemagne at St. Peter's, Rome.
871–901.....Reign of Alfred the Great.

III. ANGLO-NORMAN PERIOD.

A. D. 1066.....The Battle of Senlac.
1070.....Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury.
1081.....Conflict between Gregory VII. and Lanfranc.
1164.....Constitutions of Clarendon.
1215 (Jun. 15)...The Magna Charta.
1351.....The Statute of Provisors.
1353.....The Statute of Præmunire.
1378–1417.....Rival Popes.

IV. REFORMATION PERIOD.

A. D. 1534.....Abolition of Papal Supremacy in England.
1549.....First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.
1552.....Second " " "
1558 (Nov. 17)...Accession of Queen Elizabeth.
1559 (Dec. 17)...Consecration of Parker, 69th Archbishop of Canterbury.
1570.....The Bull of Pope Pius V. commenced the work of schism from the Holy Catholic Church in England.
1662.....Final Revision, after the Savoy Conference, of the English Book of Common Prayer.
1890 (Nov. 21)...The judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

I. ITS CONTINUOUS AND ORGANIC LIFE: II. AND ITS CATHOLIC RESTORATION.

My motto, which will serve to introduce both divisions of my subject, is found in the first and last sentences of the Magna Charta, signed at Runnymede, near Windsor, by King John and the Barons of England, headed by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, on June 15, 1215.

"ECCLESIA ANGLICANA LIBERA SIT."

"The Church of England shall be free." These words, I say, bear on both divisions of my present subject. They witness to the continuous organic life of the Church of England. For how was our national Church spoken of in our national Charta? Was it spoken of as the Holy Roman Church, or as the Church of Rome in England? Nay: it was then as now known to Englishmen by its distinctive national name—

ECCLESIA ANGLICANA

then; and think what a time that was! Verily it seemed the very darkest hour of England's Nation, and England's Church.

'Twas high tide at the Vatican. The forged decretals of Isidore, and the gigantic genius of Hildebrand had consolidated that fabric of papal despotism, which has been growing since the memorable year A. D. 606, when the Emperor Phocas, a tyrant and a murderer, placed on the brow of Pope Boniface III. the mitre of the universal Episcopate; the assumption of which his illustrious predecessor, Gregory the Great, had taught would be a mark of "the forerunner of Anti-Christ."

Only three years before the signing of the Magna Charta, King John had surrendered his crown to Pandulph, Legate of Pope Innocent III.; he had become the Pope's man, his serf; England had become a fief of the Papacy; and England's Church seemed utterly at the mercy of the foreign tyrant; but even then, in the eyes of her patriot Archbishop and Barons, she was "Ecclesia Anglicana."

And even then, when the iron heel of the foreign despot and usurper was crushing her to the ground, came the words twice repeated in the great Charta of our national freedom: "Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit;" "The Church of England *shall be free*."

Surely they were a prophecy, unconscious no doubt, of that work Catholic Restoration, would be carried out three centuries later, when England's Church regained her primitive and her rightful freedom.

I.—First: THE CONTINUOUS ORGANIC LIFE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

And *when* did the Church of England as a unit begin to have an organic life?

There was a flourishing Church in ancient Britain long before it got the name of England. By whom founded we do not know. When founded we cannot certainly tell. That Church of ancient Britain has left its mark in our Prayer Book of to-day; for in our calendar we find on June 17, the name of St. Alban, proto-martyr of the British Church. That ancient Church emerges from the obscurity which surrounds its origin into the clear day-light of history A. D. 314, at the Council of Arles in Southern France, whose decrees were signed by three Bishops from Britain—Restitutus of London, Eborius of York, and Adelphius Civitatis Coloniæ, which is supposed to be Caerlon-on-Usk in North Wales.

The Saxon invasion drove this ancient British Church, with its bishops, priests and deacons, back into the western parts of the Island, Wales and Cornwall, where it lived to confer through its bishops with Augustine, at the opening of the seventh century, and through them to protest against his claims, and those of the bishops of Rome who sent him.

Memorable is that first protest of the Church of ancient Britain; memorable as the fore-runner of many another protest which our national Church would be constrained to enter against the unscriptural and un-catholic claims of Rome in later centuries.

That protest of the British Bishops assembled at Bangor, ran on this wise:

"Be it known and declared that we all individually and collectively are in all humility prepared to defer to the Church of God, and the Bishop of Rome, and to every sincere and godly Christian, so far as to love every one according to his degree in perfect charity, and to assist them all by word and deed in becoming the children of God. But as for any other obedience we know of none, that he, whom you term Pope, or Bishop of Rome, can demand. The deference we have mentioned we are ready to pay him, as to every other Christian, but in all other respects our obedience is due to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerlon, who is alone, under God, the ruler to keep us right in the way of salvation."

Very modest were claims of Augustine, and of the illustrious Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, who sent him to the heathens of Saxon England; very modest, as compared with those of Hildebrand, or Innocent III., but even these modest claims the Bishops of the ancient Church of Britain were not prepared to admit.

To proceed.

There were Churches in Saxon England in the seventh century.

There was the Church founded by St. Augustine, sent by Gregory, Bishop of Rome, whose centre was Canterbury, and whose sphere of operation was south-eastern England—the Church of the Italian Missions.

There was the Church founded by St. Aidan and his devoted fellow missionaries from Iona, sent by the Abbot of Iona, whose centre was Lindisfarne, and whose spheres of operation were northern and central England, the great kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia—the Church of the Celtic Missions.*

---

* Three-fifths of England was evangelized by missionaries who owned no connexion whatever with the See of Rome. The authority for this statement is the Roman Catholic historian, Montalambert. See his "Monks of the West." The late Bishop Lightfoot, in his "Leaders in the Northern Church," uses this expression: "Augustine was the Apostle of Kent, Aidan was the Apostle of England."

And as we have already seen, there was the ancient British Church in Wales and Cornwall.

Very trifling differences of ritual and custom, more serious differences of race, kept apart these different branches of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in England: but while they remained apart, the national Church of England, the Church of England, as a unit in the land, had not began her history; and therefore it is too early to speak of her continuous organic life.

When did that continuous organic life begin? To leave out of view for the present the British Church in Wales, which came at a later period into union with the Church of England, when did the Churches of the Italian and Celtic Missions begin to be fused into one united Church of England?

The first step toward that union was taken at the Synod of Whitby, in Northumbria, A. D. 664.

Oswy, King of Northumbria, had been educated at Iona; but his Queen, Eanfleda, daughter of Edwin and Ethelberga, had been educated at Canterbury. Hence on the Northumbrian throne the traditions and the ritual of Iona and Canterbury were represented.

That Synod decided for the observance of Easter at the time decreed by the Nicene Canons, and in other matters also decided that the Church of the Celtic Missions in England should conform to the usages prevailing in the great Church of Western Europe.

That Synod of the Church of Northumbria showed that union was desired and thought desirable by many in authority in the Church, and in the northern kingdom of the Heptarchy.

But to bring about that union as a fact in the then divided kingdoms of Saxon England was another matter. To effect this, the Churches of Kent and Northumbria needed a man of commanding genius and dominating will.

God sent the man, who was to be the second founder and the real organizer of the Church of England. He came from a city dear to every Christian heart, Tarsus of Cilicia, the birth-place of St. Paul.

The whole circumstances connected with the consecration of Theodore of Tarsus, to be the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, indicate the over-ruling providence of God, who, at the right moment

sent the right man, to blend into one organized Church of England the Churches of the Italian and Celtic Missions.

Theodore of Tarsus was consecrated at Rome to be Archbishop of Canterbury in March, 668. He was 66 years of age at the time of his consecration. He died Sept. 19, 690. Those twenty-two years of the Episcopate of Archbishop Theodore witness the blending into one Church of England under the metropolitan throne of Canterbury, the scattered and isolated Missions sent from Rome and Iona, which had largely accomplished the evangelization of England.

Archbishop Theodore was recognized as a public blessing by the kings and people of England ; and according to Bede he was the first Archbishop of Canterbury to whom all England submitted.

How this born ruler of men, with vast practical and administrative ability, and with resolute will, made himself felt as the rightful chief-pastor of the several Churches and Missions of England; how he succeeded in moulding them into unity under the metropolitan See of Canterbury, it would take too long to tell.

Suffice it to say that the Church of England, as we know it to-day, in its diocesan and parochial organization, was mainly the work of Archbishop Theodore.

And, as Green has pointed out in his History of the English people, Theodore did unconsciously a political work for England, and helped forward that unity of the nation which was reached about a century and a half later under Egbert.

"The single throne of the one primate at Canterbury, accustomed men's minds to the thought of a single throne for their one temporal over-lord. The regular subordination of priest to bishop, of bishop to primate in the administration of the Church, supplied a mould on which the civil organization of the State quietly shaped itself. Above all, the councils gathered by Archbishop Theodore were the first of our national gatherings for general legislation. It was at a much later period that the wise men of Wessex, or Northumbria, or Mercia, learned to come together in the Parliament of all England."

It would be interesting to dwell on such an era as the Episcopate of Theodore forms in the history of the Church of England. But time forbids.

One question only I should like to ask and to answer before passing on. What was the relation of the Church of England in her newly organized unity to the Church of Rome, and to the Bishop of Rome? The Church of England was in full communion, no doubt, with the great Church of Western Europe; and grateful to Rome England's Church must have been, not only for Augustine, but also more recently for Theodore.

But did communion and gratitude imply *submission?* That is the question. Have we any means of answering this question?

Providentially we have. At the request of the King and Queen of Northumbria, Theodore, as Primate of all England, determined to divide the extensive Diocese of Northumbria, of which the celebrated Wilfrid was then Bishop. Theodore decided on this important step without consulting Wilfrid: of course this was neither just nor considerate. A few years before the saintly and humble-minded Chad, Bishop of Lichfield (whose name you will find in your Prayer Book), had submitted to the imperious will of Theodore, in his transference from York to Lichfield. But Wilfrid of York was a very different man from Chad of Lichfield. He was not going tamely to submit to the ruling of his Primate, backed though it was by the decision of his Sovereign.

What did he do? A thing unheard of before in English history: he appealed to Rome. He went himself to the Eternal City and laid his cause before the Bishop of Rome, who summoned a council of fifty bishops, who decided in Wilfrid's favour, and ordered that he should be reinstated in his Diocese as it existed before its division by Archbishop Theodore.

Elated with his success, Wilfrid returned to England in the spring of A. D. 680, bearing with him a letter from the Bishop of Rome, to which was attached the Bull, or leaden seal of the Pontiff, which was in his eyes a banner of victory, but which in the eyes of the Church of Northumbria was only a provocation and an insult.

The king of Northumbria convened a council of the clergy and laity of his realm, and then, instead of confirming the decree of the Bishop of Rome, they decided that the action of Wilfrid in appealing to Rome against the ruling of the English Primate and the Northumbrian King was a public offence, and Wilfrid for this offence was,

by the decision of the King and his council, thrown into prison. I do not justify their action, I simply state the fact.

The papal mandate declared an everlasting anathema against any one who should resist the decree, ordering the immediate re-instatement of Wilfrid in his original Diocese and summoning Archbishop Theodore to a council at Rome. Theodore showed his independence of the Bishop of Rome by obeying neither order : he did not re-instate Wilfrid in his Diocese, neither did he attend the council.

In the first century of her history then, the Church of England, while in full communion with Rome and grateful to her chief Pastor, was not prepared to yield submission to Rome. The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was *not* acknowledged by the Church of England when she began her organized life as a unit under the Metropolitan Throne of Canterbury.

Two centuries from the times of Theodore bring us to the reign of the greatest of the Saxon kings of England—Alfred.

A few years ago an incident occurred in England which showed the legal identity of the Church of England in the days of Alfred and Victoria.

In the days of King Alfred the Church of England leased to the Crown a property on a lease of 999 years. A few years ago that lease expired, and the property reverted to the body that originally gave the lease, the Church of England ; thus showing the identity, the identity in law, of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Victoria, with the Church of England in the reign of King Alfred : and thus witnessing to the continuous organic life of the Church of England through 1000 years of her history.

Archbishop Theodore died September 19, 690. We are living in the year of our Lord 1891. 'Tis therefore just over 1200 years since the death of that seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, who was the second founder and the real organizer of the Church of England.

During those 1200 years the Church of England, sharing the fortunes of the Nation of England, has gone through many vicissitudes. But the changes of 1200 years have not impaired her identity, have not destroyed her organic life, which has continuously existed

since the days when the Greek Theodore brought the Churches and Missions of Saxon England into organic unity under the Metropolitan Throne of Canterbury.

I will briefly glance at some of these changes.

The 110 years following the death of Archbishop Theodore bring us to a year very memorable in European history, A. D. 800.

On Christmas Day, A. D. 800, the proudest nobles and prelates of Italy and France were gathered round the high altar in the grand Basilica of St. Peter's Rome. In the centre of the throng is a giant figure whose dome-shaped brow and flashing eye mark a great mind and heart. Clad in the long robe of a Roman patrician, he kneels on the steps of the altar and bows his head in prayer ; then, as if by a sudden inspiration from above, Pope Leo III. advances to the kneeling King and places on his head a golden crown : the multitude in St. Peter's, with loud acclamations, hail him as Cæsar and Augustus Pope Leo III. has revived the empire of the West, and its crown is sparkling on the brow of Charlemagne.

This incident was one, says Archbishop Trench, of profoundest significance. It is not too much to affirm that it is the hinge upon which the whole history of Western Christendom turned for long centuries to come.

May we venture to connect that scene in St. Peter's, Rome, on Christmas day, A. D. 800, with the history of our Church in England ? I think we may. Who was the friend and adviser of that mighty Emperor ? One of England's foremost scholars, Alcuin of York.

The 110 years from the death of Theodore to the coronation of Charlemagne, constitute the golden age of the Church in Anglo-Saxon England.

Then England was famous among European nations for her scholars. Witness such names as Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, and the venerable Bede, translator of the Gospels into Anglo Saxon, and the father of our ecclesiastical history ; and Egbert, Archbishop of York, and his illustrious scholar, Alcuin, whom Charlemagne summoned to his court, when he would revive the almost extinguished literature of France.

And then, too, England's Church was pre-eminently a missionary Church : witness the successful labors among the Franks and

Teutons of Willibrord of Northumbria, the Apostle of Frisia, and Winfrid of Crediton, near Exeter, better known as St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany.

This golden age of the Church of Anglo-Saxon England was succeeded by a long period of religious, intellectual, and political darkness, caused by the successive invasions of the Danes, a heathen people from Scandinavia, who ravaged the land, robbed and persecuted the Church.

Alfred's brilliant reign of 30 years, from A. D. 871 to 901, checked for a time the ravages of these fierce pirates of the North, settled many of them permanently in England, and led their chiefs and many of their followers to embrace Christianity.

I might profitably linger on the beautiful story of all that Alfred was. Green says : " Alfred was the noblest as he was the most complete embodiment of all that is great, and all that is loveable in the English temper."

And I might profitably dwell on all that Alfred did for the Nation and Church of England, but I must be content to refer you to the pages of the gifted historian from whom I have just quoted.

Before, however, I pass on to the eventful times of William the Norman, let us take away with us, from the pages of Green, his estimate of the character of the greatest and best of our Saxon kings.

" Religion was the ground-work of Alfred's character. His temper was instinct with piety. Everywhere throughout his writings that remain to us, the name of God, and the thought of God, stir him to outbursts of ecstatic adoration. But he was no mere saint. He felt none of that scorn of the world about him which drove the nobler souls of his day to monastery or hermitage. Vexed as he was by sickness and constant pain, his temper took no touch of asceticism. His rare geniality, a peculiar elasticity and mobility of nature, gave color and charm to his life."

I pass now from Anglo-Saxon to Anglo-Norman times.

The battle fought at Senlac, near Hastings, on Oct. 14, 1066, which gave the realm of England to William the Norman, did not destroy the ancient Church of England, did not touch or impair her

continuous organic life ; but it was the beginning of a mighty revolution in the Church of England which for four and a half centuries affected and colored her history.

Hore, in his "Eighteen Centuries of the Church in England," says :—"The battle of Senlac was considered a holy battle. Nowhere was the Church more submissive to the Pope than in Normandy. Nowhere was the Church so independent of Rome as in England. Foreign priests joined the Norman army. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and half-brother to William, being one of its most conspicuous leaders: but in England the clergy did all they could to stop the invasion. Alfwig, Abbot of Winchester, with twelve of his monks, fought with Harold, and were killed to a man : many others among the clergy shared the same fate ; the consequence was that William came to the throne with no kindly feelings to the English Church. The cause of the Pope in England was advanced, and England and her Church for the future were brought into closer connexion with and dependence on the See of Rome."

This is true ; and yet we should be wrong if we regarded the four and a half centuries that intervened between the battle of Senlac and the abolition of the Papal Supremacy in A. D. 1534, as a period when the Nation and Church of England were totally and passively submissive to the See of Rome. The submission was never total, and the bondage was endured with frequent and significant indications, that sooner or later the day would come when the Nation and the Church would re-assert and regain their primitive and rightful freedom.

Even William the Norman, and his Primate, Lanfranc, an Italian, who had been Abbot of Bec in Normandy, and who had been consecrated by eight of his own provincial bishops in England, Archbishop of Canterbury in A. D. 1070, were not prepared to yield all that the Pope asked.

The Pontiff then was Gregory VII., the powerful Hildebrand, who had humbled to his will the mightiest sovereigns of Europe. Gregory, through his Legate, demanded two things of William. (1) The payment of Peter's Pence, said to be in arrears ; and (2) Homage, as from a vassal to his suzerain. William, says Bishop Coxe in his "Institutes of Christian History," perhaps did not know

that Peter's pence, as such, had not been paid by former kings of England. Under them the tribute had been paid for the support of their own English College at Rome. Nevertheless William was ready to settle the cash account without dispute. As to homage, he growled out a reply worthy of the bluff Harry Tudor—

"Homage to thee I do not choose to do: I never promised it: nor do I find that it was ever done by my predecessors to thine."

Lanfranc, though an Italian, was not more compliant than his King. Lanfranc, be it remembered, was a personal friend of Hildebrand. I give the account of what passed at this juncture between the Pope and the Primate of all England, in the words of Bishop Coxe in his "Institutes of Christian History."

Gregory had relied on Lanfranc to support his claim, and he now reproached his friend, as forgetting the feelings he had formerly professed of devotion to him and the Roman See.

If William was an English King, Lanfranc now rose to his position as an English Primate, and replied, "I am ready to yield to your commands in everything *according to the Canons*." The claims of Hildebrand could not even nominally be reconciled with the Nicene Canons. Lanfranc further said that he had advised William to do as the Pope desired, adding however, curtly and tartly, in the true Anglican spirit, "The reason why he utterly rejects your proposal he has already made known to your legate orally, and to yourself by letter."

This, however was not what the tamer of kings and superiors could put up with from an Anglican Primate. Thank God, Hildebrand found in Lanfranc one who would not go to Canossa. It is most important as a landmark to note the pontifical assumptions and the Anglican position at this juncture.

Thus then wrote Hildebrand to Lanfranc: "Take care to make your appearance at Rome within four months from this date. Thus may you make amends for a disobedience we have so long over-looked. If these apostolic mandates are unheeded, know for certain, you shall be severed from the grace of St. Peter, and utterly stricken by his authority; in other words you shall be wholly suspended from your episcopal office."

What happened that year of grace, 1081? Dean Hook, in his "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," tells the whole story in one line: "The Archbishop of Canterbury did not go; and Lanfranc was not suspended."

A century later, in A. D. 1164, under Henry II., the first of our Plantagenet kings, the Constitutions of Clarendon were enacted, which forbade all appeals to Rome without the consent of the King.

Papal aggression during these four and a half centuries, reached its climax during a reign I have already referred to: when King John placed the whole realm of England at the feet of the Bishop of Rome. The whole country rose against him: clergy, barons, and people calling themselves "The Army of God and the Church." It was the army not only of the barons against the King, but of the Church of England against the Pope.

On that memorable 15th day of June, A. D. 1215, says Little, in his "Reasons for being a Churchman," the barons of England forced the King to sign the Magna Charta, which was the work of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the first article of which declares, "The Church of England shall be free, and have her rights entire and her liberties uninjured."

The Bishop of Rome, of course was in a fury. He swore, "By St. Peter, this outrage shall not go unpunished." He declared the Charta null and void; and commanded the Archbishop of Canterbury to excommunicate the barons. This, the patriotic Churchman refused to do.

The Roman usurper had stretched his power too far: it snapped: and the Magna Charta remained in full force. The Archbishop required the new King, Henry III. to sign it. It has since been ratified thirty-two times; and despite its Roman nullification, it has ever since been a part of the fundamental law of England.

From the opening years of the 13th century, I must ask you to pass on to the middle of the 14th century, and to the famous Statutes by which the Church of England was then legally freed from the power of the usurper at Rome. The third Edward, the hero of the battles of Crecy and Poictiers, sat on the English throne. In A. D. 1315, the "Statute of Provisors" was passed: this was followed in A. D. 1353, 1365, and 1393, by the successive "Statutes of Præmunire" By these Statutes the Bishop of Rome was forbidden to appoint to any bishopric, or other ecclesiastical preferment in England. These Statutes also prohibited the carrying of any suits to the Roman court, and forbade, under penalty of confiscation of property and perpetual imprisonment, any one to procure from Rome, or elsewhere outside of England, any appointments, bulls, excommunications, or the like.

Thus, as has been observed, in *theory* the Roman yoke was cast off in England in the middle of the 14th century; but *practically* two things were needed to carry out the theory.

First, the removal of the popular superstition that, after all, the Bishop of Rome had a sort of divine right over all the Churches of Christendom.

Secondly, a King bold enough and strong enough to break with the triple tyrant, to say and to act on his words:

"That no Italian priest shall tithe or toll in our dominions."

As to the first, the illusion was dispelled in the 15th century: the prestige of Rome was broken by the vices and quarrels of the Bishops of Rome, by the removal of the Papal Court to Avignon, where for more than 70 years the Bishops of Rome were mere puppets of the French king; and by 50 years of rival Popes cursing and excommunicating one another. The illusion was further dispelled in the latter half of the 15th centuay by the revival of learning, and by the increased study of Holy Scripture.

As to the second, it needed only a bold King to take the first step. In the over ruling providence of God, who maketh even the wrath of man to praise Him, Henry VIII. was the man for the hour.

As to Henry the Eighth's character, we need not trouble ourselves: it was about as bad as it could be, notwithstanding Froude's white-

wash ; God, however, used him, as He frequently does bad men, for the accomplishment of His purposes.

We stand now on the verge of the Reformation era : the prophecy of the Magna Charta is about to receive its accomplishment. "Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit." "The Church of England shall be free."

Through the good hand of our God over our beloved Church, she preserved unbroken her continuous organic life through the momentous changes which the Reformation effected. The Church of England *before* and *after* the Reformation was the same: the only difference being that which obtains between a garden unweeded, and a garden weeded : the garden is the same.

When a man has been sick and has recovered his health, is he not the same man ?

When a man has been unjustly imprisoned, and has regained his freedom, is he not the same man ?

When a man has been rolled in the mud and is dirty, and when he has been washed in a bath and is clean again, is he not the same man ?

Health, freedom, cleanliness, these three great spiritual blessings the Church of England regained at her Reformation ; but in regaining them she did not lose her identity ; she did not forfeit her continuous organic life.

Now let me ask you to fasten your thoughts for a few minutes on that memorable year, A. D. 1534, when the Papal Supremacy was abolished in England.

How was the extinction of the Papal supremacy effected ? Not by the tyrannical act of a monarch, who was ready enough for any deeds of tyranny : not even by an authoritative Act of Parliament. The question was first submitted to the proper Councils of the Church, the Convocations of Canterbury and York.

On March 31, 1534, the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, and on June 1, 1534, the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of York, adopted this resolution :

" *Resolved*, that the Bishop of Rome has no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God, in this kingdom, than any other foreign bishop."

The bishops, abbots, and representative clergy, assembled in the Convocations of Canterbury and York, assented to this proposition, with the single exception of Fisher, Bishop of Rochester.

This acquiescence and agreement was not the result of hasty passion and indignation ; it was a deliberate conviction, arrived at after a full and careful consideration of the whole question.

The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge agreed with the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and later on in the same year the Parliament and the Sovereign gave the sanction of the government to the decisions of our Church's Councils.

By the abolition of the Papal Supremacy in A. D. 1534, the Church of England regained the freedom which she possessed in the early centuries of her history. The prophecy, if we may so regard it, of the Magna Charta, was now fulfilled ; and as a result a Catholic Restoration, that is, a Reformation conducted on primitive and Catholic lines was now possible. This leads to the second division of my present subject, which must be more briefly handled.

II.—THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: ITS CATHOLIC RESTORATION.

There is an essential and most vital difference between what took place in England in the sixteenth century, and what took place in Germany, Switzerland and Scotland.

In those countries the Reformation partook more of the character of a Revolution.

There was a complete break with the historic Church, the Church of the past. There was an abandonment of the historic Episcopate, and a loss therefore of Apostolic Succession. There was the setting up of an entirely new form of Church government, and the surrender

of those three orders of the Christian ministry which had existed continuously in the Catholic Church since the days of the inspired Apostles of our Lord. There was no attempt made to purify and adapt the existing services of the Church, as found in the old Service-books, parts of which may be traced back to Apostolic or post-Apostolic times; no attempt therefore to bring back the dignified and stately ritual of the early Catholic Church.

The reverse of all this happened in England In England, through the good hand of our God over us, the Reformation partook more of the character of a Restoration. It was essentially a conservative movement, and a return to primitive and Catholic antiquity. There was no break with the Church of the past; the Church of England before and after the work of her Restoration was carried out was the same; the same, with some errors cleared away, and some doctrines and rites of the primitive and purist ages of the Church restored.

So that, as Hore says, in his "Eighteen Centuries of the Church in England," the Church of England was not, as some people imagine, founded at the Reformation. It was in its essential features not Roman before and Protestant since; it was the same Catholic Church which had existed in ancient Britain from very early times, and which had been organized into unity under the See of Canterbury, by the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus.

There was no abandonment of the historic Episcopate, for many of the Bishops of the un-Reformed Church became Bishops of the Reformed Church, and were themselves the chief promoters of the work of Catholic Restoration.

To carry out effectually this work of Catholic Restoration, especially in matters of doctrine, it was absolutely necessary to protest against the errors by which the primitive Catholic truth had been over-laid and to some extent neutralized during the middle ages.

Very vigorous, and let me add, very needful, even in our days, are those protests against Roman usurpation, corrupt practices and doctrinal errors, which we find in our Articles.

As the work of Catholic Restoration in England necessarily implied the full preservation of the historic Episcopate, it also

implied that our Reformers were careful to preserve that Apostolic Succession, without which the Episcopate could not have been transmitted.

In the history of the English Reformation, there was one most critical time when the utmost care was needed, and the utmost care was taken to transmit in our venerable Church that ministry of grace and power which Christ ordained in His Church and gave to His Apostles.

That critical time took place at the opening of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

The sixty-eighth Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Pole, died within a few hours of Queen Mary. So that when Elizabeth, on Nov. 17, 1558, ascended the throne of England, the See of Canterbury was vacant.

In the election, confirmation, and consecration of a successor to Augustine, every precaution was taken that the sixty-ninth Archbishop of Canterbury should be validly and lawfully chosen, confirmed and consecrated.

The Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury petitioned the Queen to allow them to elect an Archbishop in the room of Archbishop Pole lately deceased.

The Queen granted the usual permission in a letter under her hand and seal, dated from her palace at Westminster, July 18, 1559.

The Dean and Chapter then, according to the ancient manner and laudable custom of the Church, chose the devout and scholarly Matthew Parker, Priest and Doctor of Divinity. This election took place August 1st, 1559. Parker had been ordained to the Priesthood according to the Latin Pontifical.

After this election orderly performed and signified according to law, the Queen issued her letters patent of commission for the confirmation and consecration of Doctor Matthew Parker.

The first letters patent were issued September 9, 1559. This mandate of the Queen was issued to six Bishops. The clause, "at least four of you," being omitted, it followed that if one was absent, or refused to act, the rest could not proceed to confirm or consecrate. It is certain that three out of the six Bishops, named in the first letters patent, refused to consecrate.

On December 6, 1559, the Queen issued other letters patent, naming six Bishops, and requiring them, or at least four of them, effectually to confirm and consecrate Matthew Parker, Doctor of Divinity, to be Archbishop of Canterbury. Four out of the six Bishops consented to act.

These letters patent the Queen submitted to divers doctors of the faculties of Divinity and Law, who unanimously approved of them as lawful.

On December 9, 1559, in the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, London, Doctor Parker's election was regularly confirmed, open challenge being made for any one to show reason why the elect should not be consecrated. No objection was made. Parker was present by his appointed proxies: William May, Dean of St. Paul's, London; and Nicolas Bullingham, Doctor of Law.

All the preliminaries having been duly performed, eight days after his confirmation, Doctor Matthew Parker was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, on Sunday, December 17, 1559, in the Chapel of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth, in the presence of Bishops, Bishops-elect, Priests, Royal Commissioners, Noblemen and Commoners of England.

I quote a portion of the account of this event fraught with the most vital interest to the Church of England, as given by Bailey in his valuable work in "Defence of Anglican Orders."

The east end of the Chapel was adorned with tapestry, and the floor was covered with red cloth, and the table, which was to be used for the holy offices, was placed at the east end thereof, adorned with a frontal and a cushion.

At six o'clock in the morning the procession entered the west door of the Chapel, the Archbishop-elect vested in the scarlet gown and hood of his degree, with four wax torches borne before him, accompanied by the four Bishops who were to perform the consecration, namely, William Barlow, sometime Bishop of Bath and Wells, now elect of Chichester; John Scory, sometime Bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford; Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter; and John Hodgkins, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. Of these four Bishops, two had been consecrated according to the Latin form of the old

English Ordinal, in the days of Henry VIII., and two according to the English form of the Ordinal during the reign of Edward VI.

Morning Prayer is said by Andrew Pearson, Chaplain of the Archbishop-elect: Bishop Scory delivers a sermon from the text, "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." Preaches, as the old Lambeth register puts it, "not inelegantly." He The sermon over, the Bishops withdraw to vest for the Holy Communion, and return ; the Archbishop elect in the surplice of a priest ; Bishop Barlow the Celebrant, with the Archdeacons of Canterbury and Lincoln, who were to serve at the altar as deacon and sub-deacon, in gorgeous copes of silk.

After the Gospel, the candidate is presented; the Queen's mandate for consecration is read ; the oath of office is administered ; the people are bidden to pray for the candidate ; Bishop Barlow sings the Litany, the choir responding. After the usual questions and answers, the four Bishops lay their Apostolic hands on the head of the kneeling priest, each one of them saying in English the words of Consecration ; and Doctor Matthew Parker rises a Bishop in the Church of God, and is vested in his Episcopal robes.

The Archbishop having been thus duly consecrated, the Queen, on Dec. 31, 1559, issued her mandate to the Archdeacon of Canterbury, to enthrone the said Lord Archbishop.

On January 1st, 1560, the sixty-ninth Archbishop of Canterbury, sitting in the Chair of Augustine, is enthroned in the Metropolitan Cathedral of Canterbury.

The Archbishop, having thus been confirmed, consecrated, and enthroned, the Queen, on March 21, 1560, issued her mandate for his legal investiture with the temporalities of the See.

No event in the history of the Church of England is better certified than the Consecration of Archbishop Parker. I must refer you to Bailey's "Defence of Anglican Orders," or to a book which every Churchman should possess and carefully read, Little's "Reasons for being a Churchman," for a list of the documents which conclusively prove the fact of his consecration.

In that year, 1560, Pope Pius IV. addressed a letter to Queen Elizabeth, offering to acknowledge the work of the Reformation of

the Church of England, expressing also his willingness to approve of our Book of Common Prayer, including our Communion Service and our Ordinal, on one condition—submission to the See of Rome.

It is needless to say that neither the English Sovereign, nor the English Nation, nor the English Church, could accept again that badge of servitude. In the first year, almost in the first month of her reign, Queen Elizabeth had publicly spoken these memorable words, worthy of an English Sovereign :

" Our records show that the papal jurisdiction over this realm was a usurpation. To no power whatever is my crown subject, save that of Christ, the King of kings. I shall, therefore, regard as enemies, both to God and myself, all such of my subjects as shall hereafter own any foreign or usurped authority within my realm "

For twelve years, the first twelve years of the reign of Elizabeth, the whole body of Englishmen conformed to the national Reformed Church of England.

Who broke the peace? Who commenced the sad work of schism from the Anglican branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church?

The Pope. Pius IV had passed away. He was succeeded by a man who breathed the intolerant and persecuting spirit of a Torquemada: Pius V.

On April 27, 1570, Pius V. issued his famous Bull, entitled, " The Damnation and Excommunication of Elizabeth ;" deposing the Queen forsooth from her throne, absolving all her subjects from their oath of allegience to their Sovereign, and commanding them to withdraw from their national Church.

A mere handful of Englishmen, in disloyalty to the Catholic Church in England, and in treason to their lawful Sovereign, seceded and formed the Roman schism in England.

The guilt of the commencement of schism in England, lies at the door of Pope Pius V. He too, through the Jesuits, was the constant abettor of treason against our lawful Sovereign. Yet he is a canonized saint of the Roman Breviary !

But I must draw this Lecture to a close. In tracing out the Catholic Restoration of the Church of England, I have shown you, in contradistinction with what took place elsewhere, that there was

no break with the historic Church, the Church of England before and after the Reformation, was the same. I have shown you further that there was no abandonment of the historic Episcopate, and that at a most critical time, the utmost possible care was taken to preserve Apostolic Succession.

I would remind you further, that in the carrying out of this work of Catholic Restoration, there was no setting up of a new form of Church government, and no surrender therefore of the three orders of the Christian ministry which had continuously existed from the days of Christ's Apostles. The Preface to our Ordinal, I need hardly remind you, contains a distinct categorical statement on this subject.

And finally, I must remind you that an honest, thoughtful, and to a great extent, successful attempt was made to purify and adapt the forms and ceremonies of Divine worship found in the old Service-Books of the Church: and the result is the Book which, next to the Bible, every Churchman loves—our English Book of Common Prayer.

It has passed, as you know, through various revisions; and some writer has summed up the account of the revisions in this way: The Prayer Book of 1549, the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., was the old casket of Catholic devotion, stript of all tawdry additions, and made perfectly useful and acceptable to English Catholics: that of 1552, the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., and to a lesser extent that of 1559, the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, was the casket robbed of many of its precious gems and jewels; and that of 1662, which was the result of the Caroline settlement after the Conference of the Savoy, is the original casket carefully restored and repaired, but with some precious stones still missing.

Let us humbly and devoutly thank God that our beloved Church, through all the changes of the past, has preserved her continuous organic life.

Let us thank God for her Catholic Restoration, and for those revivals in spiritual religion, in Catholic worship, and in missionary zeal, which have marked her history during this nineteenth century.

And just as we are entering on the closing decade of this eventful century, may we not thank God for a judgment issuing from the Metropolitan throne of Augustine, whose whole tendency is to sanction in matters of ritual, the work of Catholic Restoration. Let us earnestly pray that the recent judgment of the 92nd Archbishop of Canterbury may, above all things, promote ritual peace within the borders of our beloved Zion.

And as we look forward into the future, and the great work devolving on our Church in her conflict with infidelity and lawlessness and ungodliness, and in the guarding and nurture of the sheep of Christ's flock committed to her care, every earnest Churchman will pray that God will abundantly bless in all her wide realms our spiritual Zion, and every loyal Churchman will heartily re-echo the wish with what I will close—

Floreat Ecclesia Anglicana.

The Three-Fold Apostolic Ministry

OF THE

HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

A SERMON

PREACHED BY

THE REV. ISAAC BROCK, D. D.,

RECTOR OF HORTON &c.

IN ST. JAMES' CHURCH, KENTVILLE, N. S.

ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11TH, 1891.

"We cannot surrender for any immediate advantages the three-fold ministry which we have inherited from Apostolic times, and which is the historic backbone of the Church."
—*Bishop Lightfoot: "Leaders in the Northern Church."*

MORTON & CO.,
BARRINGTON STREET, HALIFAX.
A. D. 1891.

"Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons."—PHILIPPIANS I. 1.

My subject to-night is the Three-fold Apostolic Ministry of the Holy Catholic Church : Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

Let me first call your attention to the deliberate judgment of the Church of England on this point. At the end of your Prayer-Books you will three services,—The Ordering of Deacons, The Ordering of Priests, and The Consecration of Bishops. In the Preface to those Services, you will find the judgment of the Church on the subject before us to-night. It is given in these words with which the Preface to those Services opens :

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church : Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

With these words before us, no Churchman can pretend that the Church of England has left the question of the Three-fold Ministry of the Church an open question. If, as our Church asserts, there have been "*from the Apostles' time*" these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church,—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,—then they are of Apostolic appointment, then they belong not merely to the well-being of a Church, they belong to her very essence. Without the Three-fold Order of the Ministry, there is no such thing as an Apostolic Church.

I am about to present to you to-night a seven fold argument for the Three-fold Ministry of the Holy Catholic Church. I present the argument in this form, because thus it may be more easily remembered.

Let us then direct our thoughts to seven periods of history.

I First.—The times of the ancient Jewish Church.

Every detail of ritual, worship, and government connected with the Church of Israel, was of Divine appointment. What, then, was the nature of its Ministry? It was a Ministry of three Orders, consisting of a High Priest, Priests, and Levites. Was not this a type or prophecy of the Three-fold Ministry of the Holy Catholic Church?

There is, however, one point of difference. The Jewish Church had only one High Priest, the Holy Catholic Church has many Bishops. This difference might have been expected. The Jewish Church was for one small nation only: the Catholic Church, (as its name implies) is for all nations. Therefore the one High Priest of Israel is replaced by the many Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church.

II. Secondly.—The time of our Lord's personal Ministry on earth.

He prepared the way for the establishment in His Church of a Three fold Ministry. Such a Ministry existed during our Lord's personal mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. There was our Lord Himself in the first place, the twelve Apostles in the second rank, whom He ordained, and there were the seventy Disciples in the third rank, whom He sent forth to teach and to preach in the cities of Israel. (See second Lesson for this evening service.) Here then we discern a distinct preparation on the part of our Lord for the Three-fold Ministry of that Church which He was about to establish on earth.

III. Thirdly.—The opening years of the Ministry of the Apostles; from A. D. 30 to A. D. 50; from the Day of Pentecost to the first Council of the Christian Church held at Jerusalem, recorded in Acts xv.

The Holy Catholic Church starts at once with a Three-fold Ministry. There were the Apostles in the first rank, the Seventy in the second rank, and the Deacons in the third rank. The appointment and ordination of Deacons grew out of the growing needs of the Church, and is recorded in Acts vi.

The Seventy, no doubt, formed the nucleus of that Order of Elders which the Apostles ordained in every city where they planted the Christian Church. Thus in the record of the first missionary journey of St. Paul, recorded by St. Luke in Acts xiii, xiv, we read that Paul and Barnabas "ordained them Elders in every Church." And in the account of the Council at Jerusalem, we read of the Elders of the Church in conjunction with the Apostles.

Thus in the first twenty years of her history, the Holy Catholic Church had a Three-fold Ministry, consisting of Apostles, Elders, and Deacons.

Before I pass to the fourth period of history, which embraces the middle age of the Ministry of the Apostles, I pause for a moment to ask your attention to an event which closes the third period and opens the fourth—the Council at Jerusalem—held about A. D. 50. I will not dwell on the circumstances connected with the calling of that Council, nor on its decrees, important though these are, affecting as they did the whole future history of the Holy Catholic Church in its mission among the nations of the world. But I call your attention to one particular which has a most important bearing on the subject before us. *Who presided at that Council?* Who, as the mouthpiece of the Church pronounced its decree? Who would we have expected to do this? I think we should have expected St. Peter to have presided on this occasion. St. Jerome tells us that he was the oldest of the Apostles. He was undoubtedly, "primus inter pares," first among equals. For these and other reasons, we might have expected him to occupy the President's chair at the first Council of the Church.

Yet he did not do so. That place was occupied by St. James. Why? St. Luke's History in the Acts does not supply us with the answer. But Church history does. We consult the ecclesiastical writers of the second and third century, and they, with singular unanimity, inform us that St. James was the Apostle, or, as he would be called from the opening of the second century and since, Bishop of the Church at Jerusalem.

As Bishop of the Church at Jerusalem, St. James would naturally preside at a Council held at Jerusalem, the first and earliest home of

the Church of God: under him would be the Elders and Deacons of that Church.

So that in A. D. 50, twenty years after Christ's Ascension to to Heaven, in the twentieth year of the Church's history, we see the Mother Church of Christendom, governed by its Apostle, or Diocesan Bishop, and under him were the other two Orders of the Christian Ministry, Elders and Deacons.

IV. I pass to the fourth period of history; the middle years of the Ministry of the Apostles, from A. D. 50 to A. D. 60; from the Council at Jerusalem to St. Paul's embarkation at Cæsarea for Italy.

This period embraced the second and third missionary journeys of St. Paul. To this period belong eleven Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, Chapters xvi. to xxvi. inclusive.

During this period the conservative influence that has ever been at work in the Holy Catholic Church, preserved the three Orders of the sacred Ministry which were in existence during the past twenty years: Apostles, Elders and Deacons.

But during this period we find another name given to the second Order of the Ministers which it is important, for many reasons, to take note of Before doing so, however, I should mention that the Greek word for Elders, Presbuteroi, gives the name to the second Order of the Ministry, with which we are so familiar to-day, Presbyters, which is contracted or shortened into Priests; so that the three Orders of the Christian Ministry, A. D. 50, might be described as Apostles, Priests, and Deacons.

But (as I have said) during this fourth period, that is, between A. D. 50 and A. D. 60, appears a new name for the second Order of the Christian Ministry, which it is very important that we should take careful note of.

You have this new name first in Acts xx. 28, in St. Paul's farewell address to the Elders, or Priests of the Church at Ephesus. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*." The word in the Greek is Episcopoi, which we generally translate, Bishops.

This is the first time that the word Episcopos, or Bishop, occurs in our New Testament. It means, as its translation in our Author-

ized Version of Acts xx. 28 shows, an Overseer. And first it was undoubtedly applied to the Overseer of flocks, to Presbyters, or Priests.

The word occurs only five times in our Greek Testament: four times out of five it is applied to the second Order of Christian Ministers. Once it is applied to our Lord in I Peter ii., who is there called, "The Shepherd and Bishop of our souls."

In the Apostolic age then, the second Order of the Christian Ministry were called Presbyters, or Bishops. This second name was given them because they were appointed by the Apostles and their successors to be Overseers of flocks.

I admit then, and no Churchman has any hesitation in making the admission, that in the Apostolic age of the Church, the names of Bishop and Presbyter were used interchangeably. The question at issue between us and the Presbyterians, is not a question of names, but of offices. The question is, were there, or were there not, three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church in Apostolic times? And has the office (not the name) of Apostle survived in the Christian Church?

So far, from A. D. 30 to A. D. 60, that is, during the first thirty years of the life of the Holy Catholic Church, we have seen that there were three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Apostles; Bishops, Presbyters, or Priests; and Deacons.

V. I pass now to the fifth period of history which embraces the closing years of the Ministry of all the Apostles except St. John; from A. D. 60 to A. D. 70; from St. Paul's first arrival at Rome, to the martyrdom at Rome of St. Peter and St. Paul.

The portions of our New Testament that bear on this period are Acts xxviii., the Epistles of St. Peter, the Epistles of St. Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and his Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

The evidences for a Three-fold Ministry in the Christian Church during this period are very clear. We have also remarkably plain proof that the Apostles intended their office to continue in the Church. We see them providing for their successors.

Look first at the language of my text: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons."

Here we have brought before us in one verse the whole Church, together with its Three-fold Ministry. First, we have Paul and Timotheus, Apostles and Rulers of the Church, then the Bishops or Presbyters, then the Deacons, and also the whole body of the Christian laity, "all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi." That passage alone is able to establish the fact that the Church of Apostolic days had a Three-fold Ministry.

Then look at the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, and note carefully the position assigned by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus in the Churches of Ephesus and Crete respectively.

Timothy is entrusted by St. Paul with the government of the Church at Ephesus. He has under him Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons. The ordering of the public prayers of the Church; the judging of the qualifications of Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons; the ordaining of Ministers; the rebuking (when necessary) of Elders, or Presbyters; in fact the whole government of the Church at Ephesus is entrusted by St. Paul to Timothy. Timothy was to be to the Church of Ephesus what St. Paul had hitherto been, its Apostolic ruler, or, as we should express it to-day, its Diocesan Bishop.

Timothy was a young man. St. Paul was advancing in years and nearing the end of his ministry. In a most important sphere of his Apostolic labor, (specimen of what happened elsewhere), St. Paul provides that his office shall be continued. In his Epistles to Timothy we see St. Paul giving directions to one who was to be his successor in the Apostolic government of a portion of the Holy Catholic Church.

In the Epistle of St. Paul to Titus, who was set by him over all the Church of Crete, we see like directions to those given to Timothy; he was to "set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders (Presbyters) in every city." Titus, then, was to be the Apostolic ruler of the Churches of Crete, having under him numerous Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons.

During the ten closing years then of the Ministry of the Apostles, from A. D. 60 to A. D 70, we have clear evidence of the existence

of a Three-fold Ministry in the Apostolic Church. We see the Apostles and men like Timothy and Titus, and others, who wielded Apostolic powers; Bishops, or Presbyters, or Priests; and Deacons; and during this period, (when we would naturally expect it) we have clear proof that the Apostles intended their office to continue in the Church: we see them in fact making provision for and giving directions to their successors.*

VI. The sixth period brings us to the thirty closing years of the first Christian century: from A. D. 70 to A. D. 100: from the death of St. Peter, St. Paul, and others of the Apostles, to the death of St. John.

There can be no doubt that during this period, the second and third Orders of the Christian Ministry continued in the Church. What evidence, (additional to that afforded by the Pastoral Epistles) have we of the continuance of the first and highest Order of the Christian Ministry?

We have the testimony of the last surviving Apostle, St. John. In the Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ, (A. D. 95), he is directed to write to the seven Churches of Lesser Asia. To whom, by Christ's own order does he address these Epistles? To a Board of Presbyters? a Synod? a General Assembly or Conference? No: but to an individual whom he calls "The Angel" of the Church. An Angel means one sent with a message. These Angels (in Rev. i., ii., iii.,) evidently occupy an official or responsible position. Moreover, our Lord holds each Angel answerable for the good government of the Church under him.

Who, then, could these Angels be? Who but the Apostolic Rulers of their respective Churches?† Church History tells us we are right in this conclusion: more, Church History gives us the very names of the Angels, or Bishops, of the seven Churches of Lesser Asia.

---

* See explanatory note at the end of the Sermon on I. Tim. iv., 14.

† Archbishop Trench, in his Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia, after showing that the Angel could only be a Bishop, a Bishop, too, with the prerogatives which we apply to such, on the use of the term Angel, in this Book, remarks: "There is a certain mysteriousness and remoteness from the common language of man, in the adoption of this term, and such there is intended to be. It belongs to the enigmatic, symbolic character of the Book, elevated to its language throughout above the level of daily life."

At the close of the first Christian century, then we behold the Holy Catholic Church with its Three-fold Ministry: Apostles or Angels, Presbyters, and Deacons.

VII. I pass to the seventh and last period; the opening decade of the second Christian century, from A. D. 100 to A. D. 110.

At the opening of the second century, St. Ignatius, a disciple of St. John, was Bishop of Antioch. By the orders of Emperor Trajan, St. Ignatius, because he confessed himself a Christian, was taken from Antioch to Rome, and there in the Coliseum in the presence of tens of thousands of spectators, thrown to the wild beasts, so receiving the crown of martyrdom.

On his journey from Antioch to Rome he composed seven letters, mostly to the Churches of Lesser Asia; in six out of them he makes distinct mention of the three Orders of the Christian Ministry, and by their present names: Bishops, Priests and Deacons. In his Epistle to the Trallians, after mentioning the names of the three Orders of the Ministry, he says: "Without them there is no Church."

The first Order of the Christian Ministry from the days of St. Ignatius was called not Apostles, but Bishops. Tertullian gives the reason. The successors of the Apostles did not consider themselves worthy to be called Apostles, therefore they took a name which hitherto had been with Presbyter, an alternate name of the second Order of the Ministry. From the commencement of the second century, therefore, the word Episcopos, or Bishop, denoted no longer the Overseer of a flock, but the Overseer of the pastors of the flocks.

I need not pursue the matter any further. From the second century, what Tertullian says, "Nulla Ecclesia sine Episcopo;"—"No Church without a Bishop;"—has been a fact as well as a maxim.

Since the time of Christ's Apostles then, these three Orders of Ministers have existed in every Christian Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: and they continued so to exist till the sixteenth century, till Calvin in Switzerland and Knox in Scotland inaugurated the Presbyterian form of government.

Hooker's challenge to the Puritans at the end of the sixteenth century has never been answered. He challenged the Puritans of

his day to show during the sixteen centuries preceding the Reformation, one Church which had been ordered by their regimen, or one Church which had not been ordered by the Episcopal regimen since the time that the blessed Apostles were conversant here on earth.

It was the apprehension of this fact, the continuous existence of a Three-fold Ministry in the Church, and the limitation of the power of Ordination to the first and highest Order that led to the conversion from Congregationalism to the Church of England of a well-known clergyman in London, who died a few years ago. I allude to the Rev. Dr. Gibson, for many year Rector of Bethnal Green, London. I asked him, on one occasion, what led him to join the Church of England. He detailed to me at some length, the reasons that led him to be dissatisfied with the Congregational system in which he had been educated, and of which he was a Minister: and at last, he said, I sat down to read the whole history of the Church from the beginning; and when I came on this startling fact meeting me on every page of Church History, from the first to the sixteenth century, that during all those centuries no one had ever dared to minister at the Church's altars without receiving Episcopal Ordination, I made up my mind that I would never again minister till I had received Episcopal Ordination. He then applied to the Bishop of Exeter, in whose Diocese he had been exercising his duties as a Congregational Minister, and in due course he was ordained a Deacon, and then a Priest of the Church of God.

To conclude.

You should pray for God's Ministers, that by their preaching and living they may set forth God's Holy Word.

And you should pray for yourselves, that you may profit by the ministry of God's Holy Word, which you enjoy.

The Collect for St. Peter's Day is a suitable one to use: "O Almighty God, who by Thy Son Jesus Christ didst give to Thy Apostle St. Peter many excellent gifts, and commandest him earnestly to feed Thy flock: make, we beseech Thee, all Bishops and Pastors diligently to preach Thy Holy Word, and the people obediently to follow the same, that they may receive the crown of everlasting glory: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

EXPLANATORY NOTE ON I. TIM. iv. 14.

"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery."—This passage is relied on by Presbyterians as proving that Timothy received ordination at the hands of a body of Presbyters, that Timothy's ordination was in fact Presbyterian ordination. In another passage, however, St. Paul claims that Timothy's ordination was performed by himself. II. Tim. i. 6.: "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands."

How are these two passages to be reconciled? Does not the mode of the Ordination of a Presbyter in the Church of England, followed in other branches of the Church Catholic, supply the reconciliation? In the service for "The Ordering of Priests," before the act of Ordination, we have this Rubric. "When this prayer is done, the Bishop with the Priests present, shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the Order of Priesthood: the Receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the Bishop saying, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands, &c.'" The Bishop ordains with the concurrence of the Presbyters present; they signify their concurrence by uniting with the Bishop in the laying on of hands. Might not this have been the mode of Timothy's Ordination?

It is to be noted that two different prepositions in the Greek, indicate the share respectively of the Ordaining Apostle and the consenting Presbyters. Timothy was ordained, St. Paul said, "By (dia) the putting on of my hands;" and, "With (meta) the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." Dr. Macknight, a Presbyterian commentator, when discussing I. Tim. iv. 14, says: "Since it appears from II. Tim. i. 6, that the Apostle, by the imposition of his own hands, conferred on Timothy the spiritual gift here mentioned, we must suppose that the Eldership at Lystra laid their hands on him only to show their concurrence with the Apostle in setting Timothy apart to the ministry by prayer."

For a further discussion of the subject briefly handled in this Sermon, see Little's "Reasons for being a Churchman," Chapters IX. to XIII.

MORTON & CO.,

Provincial Book Store,

BIBLES, PRAYER AND HYMN BOOKS,
"CHURCH" LITERATURE,
COLLEGE AND SCHOOL BOOKS,

AND ALL

PARISH & SUNDAY SCHOOL REQUISITES.

S. S. Libraries and Gift Books,

STATIONERY OF ALL KINDS.

Printing of every description,

AT THE LOWEST PRICES.

☞ Orders promptly filled and satisfaction guaranteed.

S. P. C. K. DEPOSITORY.

PROVINCIAL BOOK STORE,

143 Barrington Street.